## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

MARJORIE FERRELL, et al.,	) )
William of the Francisco with	Civil Action No. C-1-01-447
Plaintiffs,	)
	) Judge Sandra S. Beckwith
v.	) Magistrate Judge Timothy S. Hogan
WYETH-AYERST LABORATORIES, INC.,	) )
et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)
	)

## REPLY IN SUPPORT OF WYETH'S MOTION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN CONNECTION WITH WYETH'S PARTIAL MOTION TO DISMISS

Although plaintiffs do not oppose Wyeth's request to submit supplemental authority, they suggest that this Court should disregard the recent appellate decision in <a href="Johnson">Johnson</a> v. <a href="Microsoft Corp.">Microsoft Corp.</a>, -- N.E.2d --, No. C020564, 2003 WL 23022065 (Ohio App. 1 Dist. Dec. 30, 2003). Defendants respectfully disagree.

Plaintiffs' primary argument is that this Court is not bound by an intermediate Ohio court's conclusions regarding Ohio law. (Pls. Br. at 1-2.) But even the decision cited by plaintiffs recognizes that Sixth Circuit authority establishes that (1) if the state supreme court has not addressed an issue, "the federal court must ascertain from all available data, including the decisional law of the state's lower courts, what the state's highest court would decide if faced with the issue," and (2) "[w]here a state's highest court has not spoken on a precise issue, a federal court may not disregard a decision of

Sterry v. Safe Auto Ins. Co., -- F. Supp. 2d --, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17363, \*24-25 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 25, 2003) (emphasis added) (citing <u>Bailey</u> v. <u>V & O Press Co.</u>, 770 F.2d 601, 604 (6th Cir. 1985)).

\_

the state appellate court on point, unless it is convinced by other persuasive data that the highest court of the state would decide otherwise."<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs offer no such "persuasive data" justifying their request that this Court disregard the decision in <u>Johnson</u>.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, they do not cite a single decision that disagrees with <u>Johnson</u>'s interpretation of Ohio's law of unjust enrichment. Accordingly, there is no reason to depart from <u>Johnson</u> here.

Respectfully submitted,

OF COUNSEL:

Dan K. Webb W. Gordon Dobie WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60601-9703 (312) 558-5600

William J. Baer David S. Eggert **ARNOLD & PORTER LLP** 555 Twelfth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-1202 (202) 942-5000

Dated: March 5, 2004

s/ Grant S. Cowan

James R. Adams (0008253) Grant S. Cowan (0029667)

## FROST BROWN TODD LLC

2200 PNC Center 201 E. Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4182 (513) 651-6947 Trial Attorneys for Defendants

Id. (quoting <u>Puckett</u> v. <u>Tennessee Eastman Co.</u>, 889 F.2d 1481, 1485 (6th Cir. 1989)). Indeed, this Court frequently has relied upon decisions by the intermediate Ohio appellate courts in determining the law of Ohio. <u>See, e.g., Logan Farms</u> v. <u>HBH, Inc.</u>, 282 F. Supp. 2d 776, 792 (S.D. Ohio 2003); <u>Creech</u> v. <u>Ohio Casualty Ins. Co.</u>, 944 F. Supp. 1347, 1353 (S.D. Ohio 1996).

Plaintiffs do nothing more than express their preference for Judge Painter's dissenting opinion in Johnson. But Judge Painter's opinion – which, as a dissent, obviously does not have the force of law – does not even discuss the aspect of Johnson upon which Wyeth relies (i.e., the holding that allowing an unjust enrichment claim when a Valentine Act claim is barred would amount to an end-run around the prohibition of indirect purchaser antitrust claims). Judge Painter simply disputed the threshold holding that the Valentine Act disallowed indirect purchaser claims. But that debate between Judge Painter and the Johnson majority is of no consequence here because plaintiffs have not even asserted a Valentine Act claim and do not include Ohio within their proposed group of "Indirect Purchaser States."

Filed 03/05/2004

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned, an attorney, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Reply in Support of Wyeth's Motion to Submit Supplemental Authority In Connection With Wyeth's Partial Motion to Dismiss has been served electronically this 5<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2004 on Janet Abaray, Lopez, Hodes, Restaino, Milman, Skikos & Polos, 312 Walnut Street, Suite 2090, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Joseph E. Conley, Jr., Buechel & Conley, 25 Crestview Hills Mall Road, Crestview Hills, Kentucky 41027, Kenneth A. Wexler, Kenneth A. Wexler and Associates, One North LaSalle, Suite 2000, Chicago, IL 60602, and Patrick E. Cafferty, Miller Faucher and Cafferty LLP, 101 N. Main Street, Suite 885, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, and by U.S. mail, postage prepaid upon the following:

Daniel E. Gustafson Gustafson Gluek PLLC 600 Northstar East 608 Second Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55402

Marc H. Edelson Hoffman & Edelson 45 West Court Street Doylestown, PA 18901

> s/Grant S. Cowan Grant S. Cowan, Esq. Frost Brown Todd LLC